

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.ispic.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/079,114	02/20/2002	Johann Winderl	MAS-FIN-116	6732	
7.	• 01/31/2003				
LERNER AND GREENBERG, P.A.			EXAMINER		
Post Office Bo Hollywood, FL			MUNSON, GENE M		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2811		
			DATE MAILED: 01/31/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	10/79, 114	Applicant(s)	J. WINDERL	ET AL
Office Action Summary	Examiner G. Mu	INSON	Group Art Unit	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears of	on the cover sheet b	eneath the co	rrespondence ad	dress-
P riod for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	EXPIRE THRE	E MONTH(S	) FROM THE MAI	LING DATE
<ul> <li>Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply the less than thirty (30) days, a reply received to the set or extended period for reply will, by statused the less than three months after the mailing term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>	by within the statutory mir expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro te, cause the application	nimum of thirty (3 om the mailing d to become ABAN	0) days will be consid ate of this communica NDONED (35 U.S.C. §	ered timely. ation. 133).
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	ber 2002			<u> </u>
☐ This action is FINAL.				
<ul> <li>Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935</li> </ul>			o the merits is cl	osed in
Disposition of Claims				
⊠ Claim(s) 1 - 25	má v · · · ·	is/are p	ending in the appli	cation.
Of the above claim(s) $18 - 35$				
□ Claim(s)		is/are a	llowed.	
194, 6-13, 16		is/are re	ejected.	
⊠ Claim(s) 2, 3, 5, 14, 15, 17				
□ Claim(s)		are sub	ject to restriction o	r election
Application Papers		requirer		
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on		☐ disapprove	ed.	
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected	ed to by the Examiner			
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.				
Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)				
☑ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a	)–(d).		
☑ All □ Some* □ None of the:				
☑ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.	ceived.			
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been rec	• •	lo	•	
□ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents	,			
in this national stage application from the International I *Certified copies not received:	,			
				_·
Attachment(s)	. 7			
☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s	•		nary, PTO-413	
☑ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892		Notice of Inf	nal Patent Applicat	tion, PTO-152
☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Pat nt Drawing Review, PTO-948		Oth r	· <u>-</u>	
Office Act	ion Summary			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 11/00) Application/Control Number: 10/079,114

Art Unit: 2811

ì

Claims 18-25 are withdrawn from consideration as being for a non-elected invention, the election having been made *without* traverse in the response, paper No. 10, filed 16 December 2002.

Applicants are requested to cancel the non-elected claims as part of a complete response to this office action. Note that cancellation of the non-elected claims would not preclude the later filing of a divisional application on the non-elected invention (35 U.S.C. 120, 121).

Claims 8 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The structure of the "dendritic structure" (claim 8), "bonding channel" (claims 11, 12) and "conductor tracks" (claim 13) are unclear from the specification (pages 21, 23, 26) and are not shown in the figures (37 CFR 1.83).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/079,114

Art Unit: 2811

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was

commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the

contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and

invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made

in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C.

102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Dando. See

Figure 8 with "plastic composition" 38.

Claims 1, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Dando. It would

have been obvious to use a semiconductor chip with "plastic composition" material 38 of Dando

(Figure 8), in order to cover the semiconductor edge with an insulating material. It would have been

obvious to implement a contact sensor (claim 10) with a semiconductor chip as in Dando.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Dando as in the above rejection further

considered with Saitoh. It would have been obvious to use chromium oxide to enhance adhesion

between a semiconductor die and plastic as noted as known in Saitoh (column 2, lines 28-36).

Claims 1, 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Brooks et

al. See Figure 12 with "plastic composition" 110.

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/079,114

Art Unit: 2811

Claims 1 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Japanese

document 2144946 abstract, cited by applicants.

Higgins et al is cited of interest in also showing use of a "plastic edge" surrounding the edge

of a semiconductor die.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 14, 15 and 17 are objected to as dependent upon rejected but would be

allowable over the art of record, which does not show nor would have suggested these claims taken

as a whole, if each were put in completed form as independent claims including all limitations of

claims 1, 2; 1, 3; 1, 5; 1, 14; 1, 15; 1, 17.

Munson/ek

(703) 308-4925 or 0956

01/29/03

GENE M. MUNSON

**EXAMINER** 

GROUP ART UNIT 281

Page 4